

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to overcome the outstanding §112 rejection, without narrowing the scope of the claims. Withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 7-9 are rejected under §102(e) on the basis of Glinz US '976.

Claims 1 and 3 have been canceled and incorporated into currently amended independent claims 4 and 6. Claims 7 and 9 have been canceled and incorporated into currently amended independent claims 10 and 12. Claim 2 has been amended to depend from claim 4 or 6. Claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 10 or 12. Applicant respectfully traverses because Glinz '976 does not disclose a rim at all, and the rigidity of its elastic bands cannot be determined.

The claims, as amended, disclose a tire/wheel assembly having, *inter alia*, elastic rings that are more rigid on the offset side of the disc than those on the opposite side. Such properties improve endurance of a run-flat tire when a run-flat support member is provided to a rim in such a manner that it undergoes greater deflections on its offset side than on its opposite side during run-flat operation. Glinz '976 fails to disclose a rim, or the properties of the elastic rings as disclosed in the invention as now claimed. As such, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, and 7-9 are rejected under §102(e) on the basis of Kuramori US '824. Applicant traverses this rejection because Kuramori '824 presupposes that a rim does not undergo greater deflections on the offset side than on the opposite side. As amended, the claims define a tire/wheel assembly having, *inter alia*, a rim that undergoes

greater deflections on its offset side than on its opposite side during run-flat operation. Kuramori does not disclose or suggest such a feature. Moreover, the invention in Kuramori presupposes that a rim does *not* undergo greater deflections on the offset side than on the opposite side (emphasis added). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under the basis of obviousness-type double patenting. Applicant traverses this rejection because of the patentable differences between the claims and the '824 patent.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant believes that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicant's attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Patrick G. Burns

Registration No. 29,367

February 29, 2008

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978